

1918—



—1946

Entered as 2nd class matter

Alfred University Reading Room
ALFRED UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

New York

FOREIGN POLICY BULLETIN

An interpretation of current international events by the Research Staff of the Foreign Policy Association

FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION, Incorporated

22 East 38th Street, New York 16, N. Y.

Vol. XXV, No. 36

JUNE 21, 1946

LABORITES REASSESS BRITAIN'S TRADITIONAL INTERESTS ABROAD

THE British Labor government was sustained in its policies both at home and abroad by the Labor Party Conference in Bournemouth on June 10-12. On the domestic front what Prime Minister Attlee has defined as Britain's version of socialism—social democracy with freedom—has now been inaugurated. But with respect to foreign policy, the government has been under intermittent challenge since the day it took office ten months ago. Foreign Secretary Bevin has faced much criticism from extreme left-wing Labor party members, who at Bournemouth charged that he has not moved sufficiently leftward for a spokesman of a Labor government. Once the resolutions of censure on foreign policy had been overwhelmingly defeated at Bournemouth, however, Mr. Bevin was able to depart for the Foreign Ministers' meeting in Paris with the full backing of his party. Debates of the previous week in the House of Commons, moreover, had clearly indicated Conservative approval for the government's foreign policy.

IS BRITISH POLICY CHANGING? As yet there are but few straws in the wind to suggest that Socialist doctrine plays a part in shaping Britain's course in world affairs. Yet Mr. Bevin, in his own person, is a new type of personality in British diplomacy; and the conference appraisal did not come until after novel and untried directions in the foreign field had been mapped out by Britain. Evidence of Britain's adaptability to changing circumstances is revealed most clearly in the proposed withdrawal of British troops from Egypt and the cabinet mission's offer for Indian independence, neither of which figured prominently in recent debates. Other proposals which the Foreign Secretary has touched on from time to time suggest that he intends to alter British policy significantly, although they are gen-

erally lost sight of in day-to-day controversies. At one point in his Bournemouth speech he quoted a colleague who had said: "Give me four or five years and then see what results can be produced." Bevin would be the first to deny that he thought a real world parliament, of which he has spoken on several occasions, could be established in the next few years. But as the least strong of the Big Three, Britain believes its security could be best protected within a wider collective system. For this reason Labor's support of the United Nations and its related technical agencies can be expected to continue. Mr. Philip Noel-Baker, Minister of State, recently declared that Britain will uphold the UN and will turn to it for the solution of substantial issues. Britain's approval of the United States plan for international control of atomic energy is in line with this policy.

The dangers inherent in any breakdown among the Big Three were uppermost in Bevin's mind when he addressed the Bournemouth delegates. Again and again he brought forward evidence to suggest that he had taken every means to find a basis of agreement with Russia so that the dreaded division of Europe might be avoided, but without success. Many of Bevin's statements on British policy are not new. The desire for a united Germany, for an internationalized port of Trieste with the city under Italian sovereignty, and for Russian approval of Secretary Byrnes' 25-year treaty for the control of Germany parallel the policies of the United States. What is significant is that they were reemphasized on the eve of the Foreign Ministers' conference in Paris. Even Bevin's determination to reach decisions now, or devise other means for ending the war, is not unexpected. But his candid remarks about the possibility of creating an effective economic and political bloc

Contents of this BULLETIN may be reprinted with credit to the Foreign Policy Association.

with France and other social democracies in Western Europe were revealing. Although the Foreign Office has deliberately refrained from fostering this bloc, Bevin's inference that it would not be out of harmony with Socialist thinking indicates that Britain may still turn toward such a grouping in the west.

WHAT OF PALESTINE? This country's reaction to Mr. Bevin's statement of policy has been clouded by the furor aroused by his references to Palestine. Due to his blunt and tactless words about this problem, action now being taken by the United States and Britain to canvass the technical requirements involved in transporting and settling 100,000 Jewish refugees from Europe in the Holy Land has been overlooked. Bevin's charge that the refugees were not wanted in New York does not constitute rejection of the plan of the recent Anglo-American Palestine Commission as long as negotiations continue with the Arab countries and with American officials. On the contrary, Mr. Bevin's words may ultimately prove to have crystallized this country's decision to assume a share of responsibility for the situation in Palestine. Almost entirely disregarded were other remarks made by the Foreign Secretary in connection with Palestine's future. He indicated that he believes it is not only necessary to raise the standard of living of both Arabs and Jews in the mandate, but also that general economic improvements for the whole Middle East were imperative. This is evidence of a new trend in British policy toward the Arab world which has been evolving slowly since the Labor party came to office. With the increasing strength of the Arab League, and with Russia's desire to play a part in eastern Mediterranean affairs, it is only natural that Britain should seek solutions of prob-

lems there that will protect its strategic interests and, at the same time, meet the rising nationalist demands and economic needs of the local peoples.

NEW VENTURES — NEW PROBLEMS. The suggestion made by Bevin that in due course perhaps all land in Palestine should be nationalized is the newest note struck in his entire speech—although it has been almost totally ignored. Yet it represents a Socialist approach to an overseas problem that may forecast the measures which the British government contemplates for its colonial areas proper. Nationalization of land in a mandated area like Palestine raises many questions. Probably before the issue is ever brought to a head, other steps will have been taken to transform Palestine into a United Nations trusteeship. Such Socialist ventures in the foreign field are not necessarily calculated to make Britain's policy any more palatable to either the United States or Russia, although for quite different reasons. Ideological disputes between Socialists and Communists will play an increasingly important role in Anglo-Soviet relations from now on, even should the Foreign Ministers succeed in drafting treaties of peace for large areas of Europe. Anglo-American relations may also be subjected to serious stress and strain in the future as British internal reforms become better known here. If, as many prominent Laborites fear, the United States embarks on an inflationary course which culminates in a depression, then Britain may take action to avoid the disastrous effects of such a slump on its own economy by following an economic foreign policy that might prove unwelcome to Washington.

GRANT S. MCCLELLAN

(Britain's domestic situation will be reviewed in next week's article.)

BARUCH PROPOSALS CHALLENGE NATIONS TO LIMIT SOVEREIGNTY

The United States took a courageous step toward clearing the international atmosphere of the miasma of suspicion generated by the use of atomic bombs against Japan when Bernard M. Baruch, American representative on the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission presented, on June 14, this country's 15-point program for international control of atomic energy. Mr. Baruch's proposals are based on the so-called Acheson Report, prepared under the direction of the Department of State and made public on March 16, which broke new ground for the building of international organization.

CREATION OF ADA. In accordance with the principal suggestion contained in the Acheson Report, Mr. Baruch proposed the creation of an international Atomic Development Authority which would be entrusted with wide powers of inspection over the development and use of atomic energy. The functions of the ADA would include collection of complete and accurate information on world supplies of fissionable raw materials, uranium and

thorium, and control of these materials; managerial control or ownership of all atomic energy activities potentially dangerous to world security; power to control, inspect and license all other atomic activities; the duty of fostering the beneficial uses of atomic energy; and research and development responsibilities "of an affirmative character intended to put the Authority in the forefront of atomic knowledge and thus to enable it to comprehend, and therefore to detect, misuse of atomic energy."

Following establishment of the ADA, severe and certain penalties should be devised for any nation committing violations of international atomic control, and individuals concerned with such violations should be held personally responsible for their actions, in accordance with the principles laid down for the trial of war criminals at Nuremberg. Mr. Baruch thus established a close link between the discovery of the atomic bomb and the simultaneous, equally far-reaching formulation of the concept announced by Justice Jackson, that individuals are re-

sponsible for acts that lead to war. Once an adequate system of international control has been established, the United States undertakes to stop manufacture of atomic bombs, to "dispose" of its stockpile of bombs, and to turn over to the ADA the secret of their manufacture—which at present it shares in part only with Britain and Canada. This undertaking, Mr. Baruch was careful to point out, is subject to American "constitutional processes"—that is, to approval by Congress.

NEED FOR INTERNATIONAL CONTROLS.

The proposals of the United States open the way to control of the atomic bomb, whose use in the closing days of the war has cast an ever-lengthening shadow over the tasks of peacemaking, now being tackled anew by the Foreign Ministers in Paris. As Mr. Baruch himself intimated, however, control of the atomic bomb is but one step, important as it is in the context of present-day events, toward the objective that for centuries has been eluding mankind—abolition of war itself. This objective can be achieved only through control by the international community over the factors that create frictions leading to war. If the work of the Atomic Energy Commission is persistently and effectively pursued, it may set a pattern for international control over other raw materials that have been subjects of dispute between nations, such as oil. The gradual development and acceptance of such controls would offer the most promising approach to the eventual creation of world government on sound foundations of common action in the common interest. The thoroughgoing inspection of national resources and production in the field of atomic energy, however, will at first prove difficult for all nations to accept—but most of all for Russia, which has been particularly suspicious of outside supervision and inquiry.

ATTACK ON VETO POWER. As Mr. Baruch forcefully pointed out, such controls as the United States suggests for atomic energy cannot be effectively applied if the Big Five retain the power to

veto action by the ADA, especially the punishment of violations. "There must be no veto," he said, "to protect those who violate their solemn agreements not to develop or use atomic energy for destructive purposes." The American representative made it clear that he was referring to the veto power only in connection with atomic energy. Too often it is assumed in this country that Russia alone insisted on insertion of the veto power in the United Nations Charter. This is not true, since the Washington Administration had feared—understandably in the light of Woodrow Wilson's experience in 1919—that the Senate might reject the Charter unless it assured the veto power to the United States. Now that some of the difficulties this special power reserved for the Big Five in the Security Council is apt to create have been revealed in the disputes over Iran and Spain, considerable opposition to its retention has developed among the public here and in Britain; and leaders of both British parties have indicated their willingness to accept limitations on national sovereignty for the sake of greater security. The Baruch proposals put up to all nations—but most of all to the United States and Russia—the question of how much longer great powers which officially express faith in international organization will insist on maintenance of unrestrained national sovereignty. Relinquishment of veto power in the field of atomic energy might set a valuable example for similar self-restraint by the great powers in other controversial matters that come within the scope of the Security Council. As Mr. Baruch said, "the solution will require apparent sacrifice in pride and in position, but better pain as the price of peace than death as the price of war." The issue is not one of our capacity to act—human beings have demonstrated capacity to make extraordinary exertions and take extraordinary risks in time of war—but of our will to make comparable exertions and run comparable risks for the sake of preventing wholesale destruction, and of using our scientific knowledge for constructive ends.

VERA MICHELES DEAN

JOINT ECONOMIC AGENCIES PROMOTE EUROPE'S RECOVERY

While public attention has been focused on the failure of the Council of Foreign Ministers to reach agreement on European peace treaties, economic reconstruction on the continent has been proceeding steadily, revealing a degree of highly encouraging international collaboration. The basis for this cooperation was laid by the Allied governments late in 1941, when a Committee on Postwar Requirements was set up to plan for transition to a peacetime economy.

INLAND TRANSPORT KEY PROBLEM. The Committee, proceeding on the sound assumption that Europe's transportation system would be se-

verely disrupted by military operations with a resulting postwar breakdown in distribution of food and supplies, formed a Technical Advisory Committee on Inland Transport. This agency was created in November 1942, and prepared detailed estimates of probable transport requirements in Europe at the end of the war. It also drafted an agreement for an organization that could assume responsibility for coordinating transport facilities once these had been released by the Allied Army Commands.

Accordingly, on May 8, 1945 — VE-Day — this draft agreement was put into force, with the formation of a Provisional European Inland Transport

Organization. Its membership comprised representatives of the governments of Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, France, Luxemburg, Czechoslovakia, Britain and the United States. On September 27, 1945 these eight countries, along with Russia, became parties to an agreement establishing a permanent European Central Inland Transport Organization. The new agency was created to continue consultation among its members; but its powers are limited to fact-finding and recommendations. What it does is to provide a central clearing system for priorities on repairs and traffic. Assistance is given member countries in arranging for imports of new equipment, as well as of materials for repairs of rolling stock, inland waterways, and other transport facilities. Allocation of transport equipment released by the armies is also a function of the committee.

COAL FAMINE ANTICIPATED. It was known during the war that coal output had declined and that the advent of peace would find Europe confronted with a coal famine. The breakdown of transport was expected to prevent proper distribution of even the anticipated scant supplies. It was obvious, therefore, that without intergovernmental action there would be a competitive scramble for coal, the shortage of which would act as a brake on economic recovery. Accordingly, during the latter part of 1944, creation of a European coal organization was discussed by the United States, Britain and Russia. Complete agreement was not reached, since differences developed over the relation of German coal deliveries to reparations. On May 18, 1945, however, a conference was held in London, resulting in formation of a provisional European Coal Organization, with members representing France, Britain, Belgium, Denmark, Norway, Greece, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Turkey and the United States. Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia sent observers; Russia and Poland did not participate. On January

4, 1946 an agreement, remarkable for its brevity, was signed, creating a formal organization. Poland, an important coal producer, shortly afterwards became a member.

The coal organization is a purely consultative and advisory body. A subcommittee meets monthly to recommend allocation of coal imports. Estimates are received of import requirements and coal production in member countries. On the basis of these data the needs of members are weighed and balanced against supply estimates, with the result that equitable distribution is arranged. A ready willingness to cooperate explains the success of the plan. Close liaison is maintained with the transport body, since the coal shortage is in part a transport problem.

OTHER ECONOMIC PROBLEMS FACED. The Department of State, which played an important part in the formation of the transport and coal organizations, also urged establishment of a committee to deal with general economic problems of Europe, especially food and agriculture. At a meeting in London on May 28, 1945, the Emergency Economic Committee for Europe was formed. Its membership consists of representatives of Belgium, Denmark, Norway, France, the Netherlands, Turkey, Greece, Luxemburg, Britain and the United States. Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia send observers. The Committee is an advisory body created "to provide a place where European governments can consult together and where they can raise questions of production, supply and distribution which need to be discussed and considered on a common basis." The activities of EECF are closely coordinated with those of other emergency agencies.

An important subcommittee of EECF is that on food and agriculture. It reviewed existing machinery for allocation of foodstuffs in short supply, and took immediate action to insure full harvesting of 1945 crops, as well as adequate preparation for planting in 1946. Surveys were made of farm machinery and fertilizer requirements; in addition, the Committee arranged conferences on seeds, spoilage of food, and use of insecticides. The experience and knowledge thus gained will prove invaluable to the UN Food and Agricultural Organization. Similarly, information on the general European economic situation compiled by EECF should enable the Economic and Social Council to deal promptly with the problems of devastated areas.

HAROLD H. HUTCHESON

Out this week—

ATOMIC ENERGY IN INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

by Harold C. Urey

With text of proposals for control presented by Bernard M. Baruch at opening session of United Nations Atomic Energy Commission on June 14, 1946.

25 cents

June 15 issue of FOREIGN POLICY REPORTS
REPORTS are issued on the 1st and 15th of each month.
Subscription \$5; to F.P.A. members, \$3.

FOREIGN POLICY BULLETIN. Vol. XXV, No. 36, JUNE 21, 1946. Published weekly by the Foreign Policy Association, Incorporated. National Headquarters, 22 East 38th Street, New York 16, N. Y. FRANK ROSS MCCOY, *President Emeritus*; DOROTHY F. LEET, *Secretary*; VERA MICHELES DEAN, *Editor*. Entered as second-class matter December 2, 1921, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Three Dollars a Year. Please allow at least one month for change of address on membership publications.

F. P. A. Membership (which includes the Bulletin), Five Dollars a Year

Produced under union conditions and composed and printed by union labor.